

REMARKS

Claim 46 has been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. The text of claims 47-50 is unchanged, but their meaning is changed because they depend from amended claim 46.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-18 and 29-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Bui et al.* (US 6,412,007 B1) in view of *Locklear, Jr. et al.* (US 6,252,878 B1). Claims 19-28 and 46-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Bui et al.* (US 6,412,007 B1) in view of *Locklear, Jr. et al.* (US 6,252,878 B1) and *Wipfel et al.* (US 6,151,688). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Generally, the Office Action states that *Bui* discloses or suggests most of the claim elements and that *Locklear* and *Wipfel* disclose or suggest the rest of the claim elements. However a careful review of the evidence reveals that it fails to support the arguments. Again, the same or similar citations are given throughout the Office Action, so the rejections of claims 17 and 7 will be used as examples with the same or similar rebuttal arguments applying to all of the rejected claims.

To place the rejections in context, it is important to note that most of the inventors of the present invention are the same as those of the cited *Bui* patent reference. Further, the patent applications were filed less than a year apart. The fact that the inventors are not all the same indicates that the applications were considered patentably distinct when filed. Although the inventions may have aspects in common, they have details that are not in common. It may require a close reading to see the differences. To suggest that the inventions are the same or almost the same is thus counterintuitive.

Initially, rather than return directly to the arguments first made in the Amendment dated April 21, 2003, the Applicant would generally like to focus on what appears to be a significant misunderstanding. This revolves around the term "unique" as in the claimed "unique identification value (UIV)" or "unique identification number". First, it should be noted that the term unique never appears in *Bui*. It only appears in the characterization of *Bui* given by the Office Action. Recall that most of the inventors are the same. The fact that the term appears in the present application and not in the issued patent implies that the term may not have been appropriate in the issued patent. To read the term into *Bui* is in error. Second, citations by the Office Action to FIG. 8/TABLE 4 to establish the alleged uniqueness of *Bui* are in error. Column 24, line 4 clearly discloses that the user name "John" is allotted a local session threshold value of 2. This implies that the user name John could be logged in to two sessions simultaneously. This is not unique. How does one distinguish one session from the other? The uniqueness of John the person is immaterial. The same applies to the "Engineering Dept" and "Company_A" user groups disclosed. Third, the uniqueness of individual users and groups of users as disclosed by *Bui* is immaterial as the present claims are directed to the uniqueness of "ports" as claimed. The former is external to the data communications network and the latter is internal to the network. The example user John above could have his two simultaneous sessions and the different ports could be used to distinguish one session from the other. Given that the Office Action uses the term unique in a way that is neither supported by the prior art nor as claimed, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Turning to the Response to Arguments generally, one point of clarification with respect to response (c) is noted as to the new citation to *Bui* col. 24, lines 10-59. The cited discussion is with respect only to removing a partially authorized session from one of multiple authoritative

DSCs (808, 810, and 812) as the session could not be established (line 49). (See also col. 24, line 60 through col. 25, line 15) This is not a discussion of an attempt to establish a second session that requires the removal of the first fully authorized session and the addition of the second session as claimed. Further, the discussion is with respect to checking thresholds and updating session counters and nothing to do with entries on a master list such as UIVs as claimed. The citation fails to support the alleged argument which should be withdrawn.

With respect to response (d), the Office Action reminder that the claims are read in light of the specification and that limitations are not read from the specification into the claims misses the point. The argument is that the rejection fails to provide sufficient technical details to support the proposed combination. If the combination fails technically then the rejection fails as well. The details are needed for the rejection and not for the claims. Otherwise the rejections must be withdrawn.

With respect to the motivation to combine in response (e), the Office Action provides a citation to *Locklear* that appears to have nothing to do with combining the references or supporting the assertion that "compensating for abnormal disconnections allows a controller to have current information on the status of the access server." Simply stating supposed or partial conclusions is not sufficient to satisfy the requirements for the rejection to be maintained. The logic needs to be drawn out completely so that it can be appropriately reviewed. At least in part, this is to avoid the specter of hind sight reconstruction.

With respect to response (f), the Office Action citation to TABLE 3 of *Bui* is in error. The table says nothing about "a port identification" and "a NAS identification" as claimed.

With these comments above, generally the arguments made in the Amendment dated April 21, 2003 are maintained. Thus, the cited references can not be said to render the claims obvious and it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/410,511
Amdt. Dated September 30, 2003
Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2003

CISCO-1372


Request for Allowance

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and an early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

If any matters remain which could be resolved in a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite resolution of any such matters.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN, REID, & PRIEST LLP

Dated: September 30, 2003



David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Thelen, Reid, & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 292-5800